

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1, 2, 4-19, 21-36 and 38-54 were pending in the above-identified patent application.

Claims 1, 2, 4-19, 21-36 and 38-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gagnon et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,522,342 (hereinafter "Gagnon") in view of Youman et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,629,733 (hereinafter "Youman").

Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 9, 11-12, 14, 16, 18-19, 21-22, 24, 26, 28-29, 31, 33, 35-36, 38, 41, 43, 45-46, 48, 50 and 52-54 to more particularly define applicants' claimed invention. No new matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported by the originally-filed specification.

Applicants have canceled claims 17, 34 and 51 without prejudice.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' Reply to the Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4-16, 18-19, 21-33, 35-36, 38-50 and 52-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gagnon in view of Youman. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 18 and 35 to incorporate some of the features of

applicants' dependent claim 17. In particular, claims 1, 18 and 35 have been amended to more particularly define systems and a method for providing a search feature. Thus in addressing the patentability of claims 1, 18 and 35, applicants will address the Examiner's contentions with respect to claims 1, 17, 18 and 35. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification (see, e.g., p. 56, lines 3-29; p. 66, lines 1-17) and figures (see, e.g., displays 3400 and 3500 in FIGS. 34 and 35, respectively, and step 4210 in FIG. 42).

Applicants' claims 1-2, 4-16, 18-19, 21-33, 35-36, 38-50 and 52-54, as amended, are directed to interactive television program guide systems and a method having user television equipment on which one or more supported applications are at least partially implemented in such a way as to allow a user an opportunity to enter an indication to perform a search feature. An interactive television program guide comprising a list of resources including at least a program guide database and the Internet is displayed. In response to receiving 1) an indication to perform a search feature on at least the program guide database and the Internet and 2) search criteria from the user, the program guide database and the Internet are searched based on the search criteria. The results of the search are then displayed.

Gagnon describes a "multi-channel broadcast system that transmits a video/text/graphic-based program guide data stream that is used at viewer

stations to generate a user interface that facilitates a user's selection of various programs and services" (Gagnon, col. 1, lines 10-15). FIG. 14 of Gagnon shows a user-defined multi-day event calendar that includes a Best-of-Web data service link, a schedule function link, a messages function link, and a settings function link. Upon selecting the schedule function link, a schedule function page is displayed that allows a user to review upcoming events (TV shows and software downloads), remove scheduled events, or review past events. The user can also adjust a central schedule view, filter the programs that appear in the central schedule view, review details about a scheduled event, or review past software downloads and television programs. (Gagnon, FIG. 14; col. 19, lines 10-33).

Applicants respectfully submit that Gagnon does not show or suggest receiving an indication to perform a search feature on, using search criteria to search, or displaying results of the search from, at least the program guide database and the Internet as recited in applicants' independent claims 1, 18, and 35 (emphasis added). In fact, the Examiner admits that Gagnon does not show or suggest receiving an indication to search resources: "the claimed receiving an indication to perform an inter-resource search is not necessarily explicitly disclosed by the Gagnon et al reference" (Office Action, p. 3). In addition, in Gagnon, the multi-day event calendar provides separate links for each type of service or function (e.g.,

schedule function or Best-of-Web data service), which operates independently of the other services and functions. Gagnon does not show or suggest performing any search or other action on more than one service or function at a given time.

The Examiner then contends that Youman teaches "an electronic television program guide schedule system and method for use with different resources that further teaches the use of a search resources feature" (Office Action, p. 3).

Broadly speaking, Youman describes an "electronic program schedule system which includes a receiver for receiving broadcast, satellite or cablecast television programs for a plurality of television channels and a tuner for tuning a television receiver to a selected one of the plurality of channels" (Youman, abstract). In one embodiment, the electronic program schedule system can allow a user to enter a search mode. In the search mode, a user may input characters of a program title. In response to the inputted characters, the system searches the program listings for those closest to the inputted characters (Youman, col. 31, line 23 to col. 32, line 15).

Although applicants' invention may generally implicate the subject matter of Youman, applicants' claimed invention patentably improves upon Youman by providing systems and a method for receiving an indication to perform a search feature on, using search criteria to search, or displaying results of

the search from, at least the program guide database and the Internet as recited in applicants' independent claims 1, 18, and 35 (emphasis added). In Youman, the user is only provided with the opportunity to search program listings at a given time (Youman, col. 32, lines 1-5).

Thus Gagnon and Youman, whether taken alone or in combination, do not show or suggest all the features of applicants' independent claims 1, 18, and 35.

Moreover, applicants respectfully maintain that the Examiner has failed to point to any suggestion or motivation to combine Gagnon with Youman to show all the features of applicants' claimed invention, as addressed in applicants' July 28, 2005, Reply to Office Action (see pp. 44-45).

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants' independent claims 1, 18 and 35 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 4-16, 19, 21-33, 36, 38-50 and 52-54, which depend from one of independent claims 1, 18 and 35, are therefore also in condition for allowance.



Application No. 09/733,727
Amendment Dated February 21, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of October 19, 2005

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt consideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Evelyn C. Mak
Registration No. 50,492
Attorney for Applicants

FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
(212) 596-9000



Application No. 09/733,727
Amendment Dated February 21, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of October 19, 2005

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, prompt consideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Evelyn C. Mak

Evelyn C. Mak
Registration No. 50,492
Attorney for Applicants

FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
(212) 596-9000